



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/003,750

10/22/2001

Mark Lucovsky

13768.198.1

4906

47973

7590

02/08/2006

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LAN DAI T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/003,750	LUCOVSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	lan dai thi trung	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is response to communications: application, filed 10/22/2001; amendment filed 12/02/2005. Claims 1-59 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 8, 22, 24, 27, 28 and 48 are amended by applicant.

2. The applicant's argument file on 12/02/2005 have fully considered but they are moot in view with new ground for rejection

Claim rejections-35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

1) Claims 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated Vong et al. (U.S. 6,917,373), “Vong”, herein after.

Regarding to claim 53:

Vong discloses a system, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for providing identity-centric data to one or more applications, the method including at least the following acts, comprising:

Storing identity-centric data relating to multiple identities in a data store associated with a data service; wherein the identity-centric data relates to multiple identities such that the data belongs to the associated identity and also such the identity retains control over access privileges of the plurality of application to the data, see (abstract, lines 1-17; column 1, lines 61-67; column 2, lines 1-57; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 59-67)

Receiving various requests from the applications for identity-centric data relating to at least some of the identities, see (column 1, lines 61-67; column 2, lines 1-57; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 59-67)

Providing the requested data to the requesting applications in response to their requests, see (column 1, lines 61-67; column 2, lines 1-57; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 59-67)

Regarding to claim 54:

Vong discloses a system, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for providing identity-centric data to one or more applications, the method including at least the following acts, comprising:

Requesting identity-centric data relating to one or more of the user identities from the data service, wherein the identity-centric data relates to multiple identities such that the data belongs to the associated identity and also such that the identity retains control over access privileges of the plurality of the application to the data see (column 1, lines 61-67; column 2, lines 1-57; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 59-67)

Receiving the requested data from the data service, see (column 1, lines 61-67; column 2, lines 1-57; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 59-67)

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 14-18 and 22-28, 31- 36, 38, 41-43, 45-50, 52 and 55-57, 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini (U.S. 2001/0047385) in view of Vong et al. (U.S. 6,917,373)

Regarding to claims 1 and 22, 24, 27, 48, 52 and 55 which are exemplary with claims 2, 17-18, 23, 31- 36, 38, 41-43, 45-47 and 56-57, 59:

Tuatini discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for one of the plurality of applications to operate on data related to the identity, comprising:

An act of identifying a data structure that represents data that is to be operated on, the data being associated with the identity, the data structure being in accordance with a data format recognized by the service and the plurality of applications: (Tuatini discloses an “application architecture” which is equivalent to “a data structure” includes applications and an application framework. The application framework receives requests for services from clients. The application framework identifies application action handler components and application view handler components those can service the request and format the response. Then the application

Art Unit: 2143

framework sends a appropriate application program to implement client request: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

An act of constructing a network message in accordance with a message format that is recognized by the service, the network message representing a request to perform the operation on the data structure, the network message identifying the data structure by identifying the identity: (Tuatini discloses the translation logic of translator, the view logic of view handler, and the business logic, those application functions use the services of application framework to implement their functionality. Tuatini discloses the client sends requests of services via “a request message” which is equivalent to “the network message representing a request” in a client-specific format to the application framework. Then the translator is responsible for translating the request received from the client a clients-specific format into the application-specific format defined for business logic. The application view handler is responsible for generating and sending a response that is in the client-specific format: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

An act of dispatching the network message to the service: (Tuatini discloses the client sends “request messages” which is equivalent to “network message” of “an application program” which is equivalent to “the service”: page 3, right column, lines 45-52)

However, Tuatini does not discloses such that the data belongs to the associated identity and also such the identity retains control over access privileges of the plurality of applications to the data

Vong discloses login method used to control accessing to a user profile by a plurality of applications, see (Vong: abstract, lines 1-17; column 1, lines 61-67; column 2, lines 1-57; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 59-67)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vong's ideas of control access of the plurality of application with Tuatini's system in order to provide user ability to protect their own private information.

Regarding to claim 3:

Tuatini- Vong discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes wherein the data structure comprises a content data structure that represents the actual data of interest: (Tuatini discloses the client sends requests for "services of application programs" which is equivalent to "the actual data of interest": page 3, right column, lines 45-52)

Regarding to claim 4, which is exemplary with claim 5:

Tuatini- Vong discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes wherein the data structure comprises an access control data structure; wherein the data structure comprises a systems data structure: (Tuatini discloses an "application architecture" which is equivalent to "a systems data structure" and "an access control data structure": abstract, lines 1-17; page 3, right column, lines 40-52)

Regarding to claim 6:

Tuatini- Vong discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes wherein the data that is to be operated on is not directly accessed by the plurality of application, but is only directly accessed via the service: (Tuatini discloses the clients send "request for services"

which is equivalent to “directly accessed via the service” to the application framework: abstract, lines 1-17; page 3, right column, lines 45-52)

Regarding to claim 7, which is exemplary with claim 8:

Tuatini- Vong discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes an act of the granting the application access to the data structure prior to the acts of identifying, constructing, and dispatching, wherein the decision on whether or not to grant the application accesses is based on permission provided by the identity, see(Vong: column 10, lines 59-67)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vong’s ideas of control access of the plurality of application with Tuatini’s system in order to provide user ability to protect their own private information.

Regarding to claim 9, which is exemplary with claim 10:

Tuatini- Vong discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes an act of determining an address of the service: (Tuatini discloses “the client sends the requests services of the application program,” this process is shared functionality with “determining an address of the service”: abstract, lines 1-17; page 3, right column, lines 29-43)

Regarding to claims 11 and 26, which is exemplary with claim 12:

Tuatini-Vong discloses a method as discuss in claims 9 and 24, which further include:

An act of constructing a second network message in accordance with the message format that is recognized by a locator service, the second network message representing a query for the address using the identification of the identity: (Tuatini discloses the application framework identifies application action handler components and application view handler components, those can service the request and format the response. Then the application framework sends the

Art Unit: 2143

application program to implement the client request to client: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

An act of dispatching the second network message to the locator service: (the client sends the requests of services to “the application framework” which is equivalent to “the locator service”: page 3, right column, lines 29-43)

An act of receiving a response from the locator service that includes the address: (Tuatini discloses the client requests services by sending a request message in a client-specific format. Then the translator is responsible for translating the request received from a client system in the clients-specific format into the application-specific format defined for business logic. The application view handler is responsible for generating and sending a response that is in the client-specific format: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

Regarding to claim 16:

Tuatini-Vong discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which further includes an act of dispatching the network message to the service using a transport protocol that is compatible with transport over the Internet: (Although Tuatini does not explicitly disclose transport protocol; however this feature is deemed to be inherent to the Tuatini’s system in order to perform communication between application framework and clients: abstract, lines 1-17; page 2, right column, lines 43-55; page 3, left column, lines 1-19, right column, lines 29-43)

Regarding to claims 25 and 49:

Tuatini-Vong discloses a method as discuss in claims 24 and 48, which further includes wherein the one or more computer-readable media are physical storage media: (figure 30, item 3002; Figure 40, items 4005, 4010, 4015).

Regarding to claims 14 and 15:

Tuatini-Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, further includes an act of dispatching the network request to a locator service that maintains a list of addresses for type-specific data services corresponding to the identity: (Tuatini discloses “the configuration file” which is equivalent to “list of addresses for type-specific data services corresponding to the identity” wherein the appropriate application program for request can be indicated: : page 3, left column, lines 19-63, right column, lines 1-12)

Regarding to claims 28 and 50:

Tuatini-Vong discloses a method as discuss in claims 27 and 48, which further includes prior to the act of performing the requested operation, an act of determining that the one of the plurality of applications is authorized to perform the requested operation on the data structure based on permissions provided by the identity, see(Vong: column 10, lines 59-67)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vong’s ideas of control access of the plurality of application with Tuatini’s system in order to provide user ability to protect their own private information.

**Claims 37- 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over
Tuatini- Vong in view of Shigetomi et al. (U.S. 2002/0055951)**

Regarding to claim 37:

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents grocery list information corresponding to the identity

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium that contains various services such as: “goods” which is equivalent to “grocery”, movie, MP3 and more, see (Shigetomi: figures 4 and 5)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi’s ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini- Vong’s system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in a storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Regarding to claim 38:

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents in-box information corresponding to the identity

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium which contains various services such as: “email” which is equivalent to “in-box information”, movie, MP3 and more, see (Shigetomi: figures 4 and 5)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi’s ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini- Vong’s system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in the storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Regarding to claim 39:

Art Unit: 2143

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents music service information corresponding to the identity.

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium which contains various services such as: “MP3” which is equivalent to “music”, see (Shigetomi: figures 4 and 5)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi’s ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini- Vong’s system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in the storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Regarding to claim 40:

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents calendar information corresponding to the identity

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium which contains various services such as: calendar function, see (Shigetomi: page 1, right column, lines 51-52)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi’s ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini- Vong system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in the storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Regarding to claim 44:

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure represents favorite Web site information corresponding to the identity

However, Shigetomi discloses a storage medium which contains various services such as: website function, see (Shigetomi: page 1, right column, lines 51-52)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shigetomi's ideas of using storage medium which contains various services with Tuatini- Vong's system in order to select a desire service from a plurality services stored in the storage medium, see (Shigetomi: abstract, lines 1-18)

Claims 29-30 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini- Vong in view of Susaki et al. (U.S. 6,189,032)

Regarding to claims 29-30, and 51:

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 27, but does not explicitly teach the method further comprises an act of maintaining a list of access rights to the data structure; and the act of determining that the one of the plurality of applications is authorized to perform the requested operation on the data structure comprises an act of referring to the list of access rights

However, Susaki discloses "a control table" which is equivalent to "a list of access rights", see (Susaki: column 2, lines 55-67).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Susaki's ideas of using storage medium which contains various

Art Unit: 2143

services with Tuatini- Vong's system in order to control user access, see (Susaki: abstract, lines 1-18)

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini- Vong in view of Jenkins et al. (U.S. 6,678,682)

Regarding to claim 19:

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the identity is an individual

However, Jenkins discloses the principal could be "users" which is equivalent to "individuals", see (Jenkins: column 7, lines 10-15)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jenkins's ideas of using an access control rule ties together with what principals such as user, companies with Tuatini- Vong's system in order to perform what actions within their rights, see (Jenkins: column 6, lines 45-46)

Regarding to claim 20:

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the identity is a group of individuals

However, Jenkins discloses the principal could be "division" which is equivalent to "group of individuals," see (column 7, lines 10-15)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jenkins's ideas of using an access control rule ties together with what principals such as user, companies with Tuatini- Vong's system in order to perform what actions within their rights, see (Jenkins: column 6, lines 45-46)

Regarding to claim 21:

Tuatini- Vong i discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the identity is an organization

However, Jenkins discloses the principal could be “companies” which is equivalent to “organizations,” see (column 7, lines 10-15)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jenkins’s ideas of using an access control rule ties together with what principals such as user, companies with Tuatini- Vong’s system in order to perform what actions within their rights, see (Jenkins: column 6, lines 45-46)

Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini-Vong in view of Robotham et al. (U.S. 2002/0015042)

Regarding to claim 13:

Tuatini- Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach wherein the act of constructing a network message in accordance with a message format that is recognized by the service comprises the following: an act of constructing a network message in accordance with the Simple Object Access Protocol

However, Robotham discloses requests and responses between client and server may use a protocol such as the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP), see (Robotham: page 10, left column, lines 35-43)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Robotham’s ideas of using Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) for requesting and responding between client and server with Tuatini- Vong’s system in

order to allows the server to provide rendering services to any client that supports the protocol and the client can interpret the XML-encode contents provided by the server, see (Robotham: page 10, left column, lines 35-43)

Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Tuatini-Vong in view of Mache et al. (U.S. 2002/0035533)

Regarding to claim 58:

Tuatini-Vong discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 55, but does not explicitly teach using Simple Object Access Protocol

However, Mache discloses this figure, see ([0172])

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mache's ideas of using Simple Object Access Protocol with Tuatini-Vong's system in order to security communication protocol, see ([0172])

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2143

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to lan dai thi truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on monday- friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lan Dai Thi Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

Ldt
02/01/2006



JEFFREY PWU
PRIMARY EXAMINER